






REZ-23-05 – Scarboro Apartments – V5 Submittal review cycle

START DATE: <b>MAY 2024</b>	DUE DATE: <b>05-15-24</b>	TRC/STAFF Comments issued on: <b>05/13/2024</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------	---

Review Group /Staff	Comments	Cleared Comments
Planning & Zoning – Planning Staff	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Continue to Provide</i> a written response to ALL the comments.</li> <li>2. <i>Continue to Add</i> revision dates to ALL materials – add a Date/Revision date to the Conditions.</li> <li>3. <u>FYI – TIA Status</u> – TIA must be completed before scheduling for Planning Board; the NCDOT Congestion Management review that typically happens after completion of the TIA report does not have to be complete in order to schedule and move forward to Planning Board, so long as all sides do not believe that DOT will have any MAJOR recommendations.</li> <li>4. <u>Conditions and Exhibits</u> – All the intended Attachments to the Conditions, if they are to be called “EXHIBITS”, these need to be names – suggest A, B, C – and they need to be provided. See the Yellow highlights in the Conditions mark-up for examples of the references that should be stating “Exhibit #XYZ”.                         <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Example 1</u>: V5 Condition 1 refers to “Concept Plan dated May 1, 2024” but does not call it ‘Exhibit #’</li> <li>b. <u>Example 2</u>: Two files that look like project layouts were submitted – neither have clear titles on them, neither are titled “Exhibit X”, the PDF file names of both had the words “concept plan” in them, one of them had “Rendering” in the PDF file name, etc. – clean this up, label and name each of these appropriately, and if these are Exhibits to the Conditions, then somewhere in the Conditions each of these must be referred to (why include if not referred to ?).</li> <li>c. <u>Example 3</u>: V5 did not include what is referenced in Condition 2 as “Exhibit A”, which is the Principal Use table detailing the Permitted and Prohibited uses for this proposed TC District. <b>See Mark-up of the Use Table with Staff suggestions based on recent Town Board actions.</b></li> </ol> </li> <li>5. <u>FYI – V4 Condition #6</u> – Regarding the amount of Non-Residential Square Footage proposed (only 10,000 SF is committed to) relative to 240 multifamily dwelling units- the Applicant response comparing Cobblestone’s 600’ of S. Main St. frontage to this sites 200’ of S. Main St. frontage is non-explanatory in Staff’s opinion. If a ratio were applied, Cobblestones 53,000 SF would then ratio to Scarboro (having 1/3 the frontage to: <math>53,000 / 3 = 17,666</math> SF. Further a significant amount of the Cobblestone non-residential is interior to the site, neither visible nor accessible from S. Main Street, and thus the amount of linear frontage on S. Main Street has little to do with the amount of non-residential in (Cobblestone). Regardless, the LDO has no regulatory ratio of Residential Units to Non-residential square footage, so there is no metric to govern this. Finally, Applicant responded that the proposed Scarboro 10K-20K min/max range of Non-residential is ‘<i>not inconsistent with other Town Center Districts</i>’. It is <u>inconsistent with the only other TC District that exists (Cobblestone)</u> as explained in the original Comment. The Town Board of Commissioners shall determine if the ratio of Dwelling Units to committed Non-residential square footage is appropriate.</li> </ol>	

REZ-23-05 – Scarboro Apartments – V5 Submittal review cycle

	<p>6. <u>Condition 12</u> – Explain or clarify, if and how this condition is exceeding the LDO Minimum regarding the TC District frontage requirements along S. Main Street and/or Section 6.2.2.2. for streetscape Buffers. Staff is looking for lead-ins like “The Development shall exceed the minimum of XXX by providing YYY...” – the nature of LDO Conditional zoning does not allow for give-and-take development standards, only things that exceed or do better than the LDO standards. Staff understands that some of the proposed Conditions are more so serving the purposes of explaining a situation that may ultimately be the by-right development requirement at future stages of development, and wants to understand if #12 is that or something else. Staff recognizes this condition has not changed from V4, and if this was previously covered, apologizes for repetition.</p>	
Parks & Recreation - Eddie Henderson	No further comments.	
NCDOT – Trevor Darnell	No further Comments.	
COR Public Utilities - Tim Beasley	<i>FYI - a downstream sewer capacity study will be required prior to CD Approval. Any improvements identified are required to be designed for replacement with the CDs.</i>	
Wake County Fire / EMS - Brittany Hocutt	<i>No additional issues or comments at this time.</i>	
Engineering - Brian Laux / Jacque Thompson	<i>See PDF of Memo comments offered more so as FYI about future development plans for the proposed project; there are no corrections required from this review/these comments.</i>	
Wake Co. Watershed Mgmt - Janet Boyer	(V3) Wake Co. permits for Stormwater & Erosion / Sediment Control required prior to construction.	